



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

## CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE NED.

It is hardly necessary to sing the praises of the *New English Dictionary*. The work done by Murray, Bradley, Craigie, and their collaborators is not likely to be superseded, in the present generation at least. The work is not only a dictionary of modern English but in fullness of information far surpasses the special dictionaries for the Middle English period. The almost inexhaustible amount of material, however, renders it impossible to make such a work absolutely definitive. An exhaustive collection of the lexicographical material in individual texts brings to light here and there a neglected word or use of a word.

In preparing a glossary recently for the Middle English *Dame Siriz, Vox and Wolf*, and *Sir Cleges*, my indebtedness to the *NED*. has been incalculable. When I have found a use of a word not cited in it, I have felt it to be a veritable discovery. The few discoveries of this kind that I have made, I offer here in two short lists; the first containing words not found by me in the *Dictionary*, the second containing citations earlier than those recorded in it.

A. Words not found in *NED*. :

*buske*, in the sense 'beat.' No man he wold buske ne bete. *Sir Cleges*, Oxf. text, 20.

*castell-gate*, 'castle gate.' *Sir Cl.* (Oxf. text), 254.

*gode sir*, a polite form of address. The only word cited is *goodsire*, 'grandfather.'

*heie-renning*, 'running at the eyes.'—*D. S.* 283.

*houssong*, -e, 'matins' (?) *V. & W.*, 265, 270, 274.

*how-pat-euer*, adv., 'however.' *Sir Cl.* (Oxf. text), 420.

*leuelif*, 'sweetheart.' *D. S.*, 30.

*loue-uere*, 'physical expression of love.' *D. S.*, 374.

*nones-kunnes*, 'no kind of.' *V. & W.*, 294. Cf. however, *Kind*, sb. 14 and *Kin*', 6b.

*notys*, pl., 'musical instruments of some kind.' *Sir Cl.*, 101. Possibly a textual error. The *Edinb.* text has *luttys*.

*of-slyfe*, 'break off.' *Sir Cl.*, 214. Not cited under *off*-.

*serteyn*, *Sir Cl.*, 162. Possibly a textual error.

B. Citations earlier than those in *NED*. :

*all-wey*, 'in any event.' *Sir Cl.*, 227. *NED*. cites Caxton's *Eneydos*, 1490.

*almus-folke*, 'charitable people.' *Sir Cl.*, 31. *NED*. cites *alms-folk* from *Hollinsh. Chron.*, 1587.

*amidward*, 'in the middle of.' *V. & W.*, 274. *NED*. cites the word from *Pallad. on Husb.* 1420, in the sense 'toward the middle.'

*bless þe*, excl. 'God bless you!'; *D. S.*, 201. *NED*. under the verb 'bless,' meaning *iv*, cites "Exclamatory, elliptical and ironical uses" from 1588 on.

*ofte-tyme*, 'often.' *Sir Cl.*, 488. The earliest citation is about contemporary, 1414.

*ryalty*, 'munificence,' 'generosity.' *Sir Cl.*, 73. The earliest citation of 'royalty' in this sense is from 1548.

I can say with Chaucer,

"And I come after, glening here and there,  
And am ful glad if I may finde an ere  
Of any goodly word that ye han left."

GEORGE H. McKNIGHT.

Ohio State University.

## THE LEGENDARY DANTE

*La Leggenda di Dante. Motti, Facezie e Tradizioni dei Secoli XIV-XIX. Con introduzione di G. PAPINI.* Lanciano: R. Carabba, editore, 1911. 16mo., pp. 128. Frontispiece, "Ritratto di Dante attribuito a Raffaello, esistente in Monaco."

In 1873 the distinguished bibliophile, Giovanni Papanti, published at Leghorn his collection of Dante anecdotes under the title: *Dante, secondo la tradizione e i novellatori*. The book has long been out of print and it was a happy thought on the part of Papini to prepare for his very attractive collection, "Scrittori Nostri," a similar volume. Papanti covered the ground so thoroughly that he left his successors little to do, and we regret that Papini has done that little not very well. He has been able to use improved editions issued since Papanti's day, notably Solerti's lives of

Dante, Petrarch and Boccaccio (Milan, 1904), various reviews of Papanti's book, as well as Mr. Koch's admirable catalogue of the Fiske Dante Collection at Cornell University and Mr. Toynbee's *Dante in English Literature from Chaucer to Cary*.

The most important differences between Papini and Papanti are as follows. Papini omits a number of articles in Papanti relating to the fame and praise of the poet, but not anecdotes properly speaking. There are fourteen such in Papanti: pp. 1, 3, 26, 34, 58, 82, 85, 118, 134, 175, 179, 185, 187, and 200. Most inconsistently Papini prints at the very end of his volume, p. 120, "Dante in Parnaso," an extract from Boccacini's *Ragguagli di Parnaso*, which Papini himself says has nothing to do with the legend of Dante, and adds: "Ma ho pensato di metterlo come curiosità ed anche perchè non esce del tutto dal quadro del volume." With this reasoning he might as well have included all the Papanti articles which he has omitted. He also prints p. 105, a long article "Dante Mago," although as he says in the very first words: "Su Dante mago non vi sono leggende propriamente dette."

As to new material Papini claims to have added forty new legends or versions not found in Papanti. If this new material is carefully examined it will be found that most of it consists in new versions of stories already in Papanti. Of absolutely new material, that is, of material not found in Papanti in any form, there are only eight stories, one of which is the irrelevant extract from Boccacini mentioned above. Four of the remaining seven are from Giovan Mario Filelfo's life of Dante (Solerti, p. 175): (a) Papini, p. 37, "Roganti Gerio Belli filio, quis esset in civitate sapientior, eum esse respondit quem stulti magis odissent"; (b) Papini, p. 38, some one complained that Florence was badly governed because provisions were high. Dante answered "Fortasse et apud Corinthum vilius est frumentum," meaning that Florence was so large and rich that things could not be so cheap there as in country places where there was little money; (c) Papini, p. 38, Dante's reply to "Ianoto Pacio," who had insulted him, "Responderem tibi nisi essem ira-

tus"; (d) Papini, p. 98, "Dante consiglier d'amore," Aldrovandinus Donatus asks Dante's advice in regard to obtaining the favour of his mistress, for whose sake he had devoted himself to poetry and learning. Dante replies by asking him why the nightingale sings only part of the year. Aldrovandinus cannot tell, and Dante explains that as long as the nightingale is wooing it sings, when it is mated it is silent. The three remaining anecdotes are as follows. Papini, p. 36,—Don Luis Milan, *El Cortesano*, Madrid, 1874, p. 139,—Dante was highly esteemed by the Florentines but despised them and hid from them. A wise man said the only way to find him was to begin some remark and leave it unfinished and Dante would certainly complete it. The remark he advised them to make was "Who knows the good?" So the Florentines went about saying this and Dante who was among them disguised answered "He who has experienced evil." This recalls the story of the egg with salt, Papanti, p. 183; Papini, p. 52. The second anecdote is the curious story told by the Englishman, Edward Wright, in *Some Observations made in travelling through France, Italy, &c. in the Years MDCCXX, MDCCXXI, and MDCCXXII* (see Toynbee, vol. I, p. 216), of Dante's kleptomania. The third and last story is from Taddeo del Branca, *Liber penitentiae* (published by C. Cipolla, *Taddeo del Branca e una tradizione leggendaria sull'Alighieri*, Torino, 1887). Dante is here represented as a famous preacher enjoying the popularity of the crowd. One day as he is about to ascend the pulpit an old woman falls down before him and pours out her praises. Dante replies that he has acquired his ability by study and abstinence. He then mounts the pulpit but is unable to speak; at last he says that virtue is gone from him and that he is not worthy of the gifts of God. He descends and "sic miser ille fuit semper ignarus in omnj."

Papini gives, p. 39, as new material, the story of Dante and Cecco d'Ascoli, which Papanti, p. 197, gives in an Italian résumé. I shall return to this story later. On p. 117, Papini marks with an asterisk as new material the Letter of Frate Ilario, which, however, is printed by Papanti, p. 202, from Fraticelli's

Life of Dante. Papini uses a better text (that in Rajna's *Dante e la Lunigiana*), but the difference is after all very slight.

It will be seen that the absolutely new material is small and unimportant. The new versions are not of great interest. From Toynbee, Papini, p. 24, has taken John Williams's *Letter to the Duke of Buckingham* ("Who will go if I stay?"); p. 32, Sir John Harington's *Epigram* ("Elephant"); p. 57, John Gower's *Confessio Amantis* ("Why Dante is esteemed less than a buffoon"); p. 68, T. Carlyle, *Lectures on Heroes* (same topic); p. 68, Jeremy Collier (same topic); and p. 77, Burton, *Anatomy of Melancholy*, "Dantes, that famous Italian Poet, by reason his clothes were mean could not be admitted to sit down at a feast." This is hardly an anecdote. A number of other versions, which I have not space to mention, might have been taken from the same source. It is strange that both Papanti and Papini have overlooked Dante Gabriel Rossetti's fine poem "Dante at Verona," which contains versions of three anecdotes: "Dante torna dall'Inferno," "Why Dante is esteemed less than a buffoon," and "Bones." Some of the other new versions are: four stories by Marcantonio Nicoletti ("Elephant," "Dante pronto risponditore," "Dante e la meretrice," and "Dante e il bugiardo"), all in Solerti; "Dante torna dall'Inferno," versions by Benvenuto da Imola, Giannozzo Manetti, Landino and Filelfo, all in Solerti; two anecdotes by Secco Polentone and Gabriello Simeone ("Why Dante is esteemed less than a buffoon") published by Graf in the *Giornale storico*, vol. vi, 475-6; etc.

A certain number of the anecdotes relating to Dante belong to the jest literature of the world and Papini's parallels could easily be increased. I shall mention only a few recent additions to the literature of the subject. The story of Dante pouring the food over the rich garments is found in Nasreddin (naturally not told of Dante), the recent edition by A. Wesselski, *Der Hodscha Nasreddin. Türkische, arabische, berberische, maltesische, sizilianische, kalabrische, kroatische, serbische und griechische Märlein und Schwänke*. Weimar, Duncker, 1911, gives, vol. I, p. 222 (to No. 55) a

considerable number of additional references. Three anecdotes: "Dante e la ragazza," "Dante e Cecco d'Ascoli" (the Cat and the Candlestick), and "Dante chiede a chi dimanda" are found in the jokes of Piovano Arlotto, recently edited by the same Wesselski, *Die Schwänke und Schnurren des Pfarrers Arlotto*, Berlin, Duncker, 1910. The stories in question are found respectively in vol. II, p. 215 (to No. LXXI), I, p. 213 (to No. LIV), and II, p. 238 (to No. CXXXI). The second story mentioned above, the Cat and the Candlestick, has just been made the subject of a remarkable study by E. Cosquin, "Le conte du chat et de la chandelle dans l'Europe du moyen âge et en Orient," *Romania*, t. XL (1911), 371-430, part first. While I am on this subject I may remark that Papanti's book is still superior to Papini's as it prints a large number of parallels from scarce works, which are only referred to in Papini.

I regret that I must dwell on the inexcusable and inexplicable carelessness with which Papini has edited his texts. Ordinary mistakes in proof reading may be pardoned, although there are too many of these; but there are worse errors. Papini had the advantage of consulting the reviews of his predecessor's book. In one of these Köhler (*Kleinere Schriften*, II, 630) pointed out Papanti's frequent mistakes, particularly in the Latin texts. Papini, strange to say, has reprinted some of these and repeated all of Papanti's errors, although in one case at least the point of the story is spoiled: e. g., p. 58, l. 19, "et ipse similiter te dictabit," it should of course be "me dictabit." In the same short story occur these misprints: *ali-quandiu* for *aliquamdiu*, *canis* for *Canis*, *preter quam* for *praeterquam*, *inetiae* for *ineptiae*, *equum* for *aequum*, *conteneret* for *contemneret*, *haberi* for *habearis*, *presto* for *praesto*, and *Domini* for *domini*. Papini simply copied Papanti, who used a ms., which explains some of the above forms, but Papini should have given a readable text.

A still more remarkable instance of carelessness occurs in the two anecdotes, pp. 36 and 65, from Don Luis Milan's *El Cortesano*. The first extract is credited to the *Jahrbuch für*

*romanische und englische Sprache und Literatur*, vol. XIV, p. 453; the second extract is credited to the edition of the *Cortesano* in *Coleccion de libros españoles raros ó curiosos*, vol. VII, Madrid, 1874. Now instead of correcting his texts by the Madrid edition in both cases, Papini actually reprints the version in the *Jahrbuch* with its incredible blunders (e. g., *inhadado testo* for *enhadado desto*, *vyese* for *oyese*, etc.), and has added some of his own, such as the omission of *no* before *le podian hallar*, which of course spoils the point of the story. In almost every case in this extract the accents are wrong. In the extract credited to the Madrid edition there are only five misprints, none of them very bad, e. g., *may* for *muy*, *senor* for *señor*, *è* for *e*, etc.

Even where Papini has a good text before him he is apparently unable to reproduce it correctly: in an extract from Filelfo (Solerti, p. 175, Papini, p. 38), *nec vellet peccare* becomes *nes vel et peccare*; wrong divisions are constant, e. g., p. 55, *adalte-ram*, p. 81, *curante* for *cur ante*, p. 95, *sudort antus*, etc. How could Papini overlook such a misprint as *quibuasdam*, p. 91, or constantly quote Petrarch's work under the impossible form *De rerum memorandarum*? Mistakes in proper names are not common, but I have noted, p. 78, Godwin for Gladwin (the correct form occurs on p. 84, so there are two entries in the index), Ginfà for Giufà, p. 104, Geffchen for Geffcken. I have no space left to mention the errors in the English extracts, but I must not overlook *loud* for *lond* in Gower, p. 58.

Finally, there is something to criticize even in the frontispiece. The statement is "Ritratto di Dante attribuito a Raffaello esistente in Monaco." I cannot find that this portrait (first reproduced in the *Jahrbuch der deutschen Dante-Gesellschaft*, vol. II, 1869) has ever been attributed to others than Masaccio and Ghirlandajo, see R. T. Holbrook's *Portraits of Dante from Giotto to Raffael*, p. 8, the portrait faces p. 10.

T. F. CRANE.

Cornell University.

*Deutsche Schrifttafeln* des IX. bis XVI. Jahrhunderts aus Handschriften der K. Hof- und Staatsbibliothek in München. Herausgegeben von ERICH PETZET und OTTO GLAUNING. I. Abteilung. Althochdeutsche Schrift Denkmäler des IX. bis XI. Jahrhunderts. München: Druck u. Verlag von Carl Kuhn, 1910. Fol.

This is the first number of a collection of collotype facsimiles from German manuscripts, intended to illustrate the development of writing in Germany from the earliest period to the time when printed books took the place of written codices. The whole series is to consist of five numbers, published at the price of M. 7.— (or in cloth binding M. 8.—) for each number. The specimens have been selected in every instance from manuscripts of the Royal Library in Munich.

The scope of the first number is not—as one might suppose from the title—strictly confined to Old High German, since it includes a specimen of the cod. Monacensis of the Heliand (pl. VII). Among the Old High German texts represented in this number the best known probably are: the Wessobrunn Prayer (pl. I, the entire poem), the Muspilli (pl. VI), Otfrid (pl. VIII, last page of the Freisingen ms.), and Williram's Paraphrase of the Song of Solomon (pl. XV, first page of the Ebersburg ms.). In addition to these, facsimiles are given of the 'Exhortatio ad plebem christianam' (pl. II), the Freisingen Paternoster (pl. III, two different versions), the Franconian Prayer (pl. IV), the 'Carmen ad Deum' (pl. V), the Song in praise of St. Peter (pl. IX), the Augsburg Prayer (pl. X), two specimens of OHG. Glossaries (pl. XI and XII), Otloh's Prayer (pl. XIII), and the Munich fragment of Notker's Psalms (pl. XIV).

Several of these facsimiles, to be sure, are accessible in other works (e. g. plates I, II, III<sup>b</sup>, IV, VI, VIII, IX, in M. Enneccerus, *Die ältesten deutschen Sprachdenkmäler*, Frankfurt a. M., 1897; pl. XV in W. Walther, *Die deutsche Bibelübersetzung des Mittelalters*, etc.). The